

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8 have been amended.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 have been canceled.

Claims 9-12 have been added.

Support for the amendment to Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8 is provided by corresponding claims as previously presented and the specification at page 5-19. Support for new Claims 9-12 is provided by the Examples, for example compound A3 on page 19.

No new matter has been entered by the present amendments.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, and 7-12 are pending in the present application.

The rejection of Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph (enablement), is obviated by amendment.

Applicants make no statement with respect to the propriety of this ground of rejection. However, the Examiner recognizes that the specification enables ingredient (B) represented by Donepezil or Tacrine. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to define ingredient (B) as being selected from Donepezil or Tacrine.

Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

The rejection of Claims 3 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph (enablement), is obviated by amendment.

Applicants make no statement with respect to the propriety of this ground of rejection. However, the Examiner recognizes that the specification enables a pharmaceutical composition for treating Alzheimer's disease. Accordingly, independent Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to replace the objected to phrase "to improve cerebral function" with "to treat Alzheimer's disease". Claim 3 has been canceled.

Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

The rejection of Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is obviated by amendment.

Applicants make no statement with respect to the propriety of this ground of rejection. However, to expedite examination, Applicants have removed the objected to term in the definition of ingredient (B).

Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

The rejection of Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mealy et al is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the presently claimed invention differs from the disclosure of Mealy et al in that this reference fails to disclose or suggest a compound within the scope of ingredient (A). Further, there is no suggestion in Mealy et al to direct the artisan to modify any compound disclosed therein such that it would fall within the scope of ingredient (A). Therefore, Applicants submit that the presently claimed invention is not obvious in view of Mealy et al.

Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

The objection to Claims 1-8 as containing non-elected subject matter is obviated by amendment. Applicants thank the Examiner for the kind suggestion. Applicants request withdrawal of this ground of objection.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

Early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Registration No. 50,552

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)